Case 3:07-cv-05519-FDB Docume	ent 18 Filed 01/15/08 Page 1 of 2	
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA		
PAUL WILLIAM DRIGGERS,		
Plaintiff,	Case No. C07-5519 FDB	
v.	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION AND MOTION	
DANIEL ENGLISH et al.,	FOR FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW	
Defendants.	CONCEOSIONS OF EAW	
This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration of the Court's		
Order dismissing Plaintiff's civil rights action for lack of jurisdiction and motion for findings of fact		
and conclusions of law.		
Pursuant to Local Rules W.D. Wash. CR 7(h)(1), motions for reconsideration are disfavored,		
and will ordinarily be denied unless there is a showing of (a) manifest error in the prior ruling, or (b)		
facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to the attention of the court earlier,		
through reasonable diligence. Plaintiff has not made the requisite showing as to either of the grounds		
for reconsideration under CR 7(h)(1)		
As demonstrated in the various pleadings in the record, Plaintiff is confined in a federal		
corrections facility in Florence, Colorado. The defendants are individuals and governmental agencies		
of the State of Idaho, and the actions giving rise to the complaint appear to have occurred in Idaho.		
Thus, the Western District of Washington do	bes not have jurisdiction to entertain Plaintiff's request to	

ORDER Page - 1

## 

1	proceed in forma pauperis in the instant civil rights action.		
2	ACCORDINGLY;		
3	IT IS ORDERED:		
4	(1)	Plaintiff's Motion for Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law <sup>1</sup> [Dkt #15] is <b>DENIED</b> ;	
5	(2)	Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration [Dkt #16] is <b>DENIED</b> .	
6	(3)	The Clerk is directed to send copies of this Order to plaintiff, and to the Hon. J.	
7		Kelley Arnold.	
8	DATED this 15 <sup>th</sup> day of January, 2008.		
9			
10			
11		fall (	
12		FRANKLIN D. BURGESS	
13		UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
<ul><li>27</li><li>28</li></ul>		R Civ. P. 52(a) and (b), cited by Plaintiff is inapplicable. Rule 52 governs trial ithout a jury.	

ORDER Page - 2